

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 27 2006

The USA Patent Office

Today's date: 27th January, 2006.

Amendments to patent application 10/076,266; Filing date 02/15/2002.

Applicant: Denis E. Solomon

E-mail: denissolomon@yahoo.com

In adhering to the examiner's objections, I respectfully submit the following changes to the application.

- (1) I would remove from p.22, the 3rd paragraph---'If this dressing.....'
- (2) Also from p.22, the 5th paragraph-----'It is envisaged.....'
- (3) I would also remove from p.16, the whole sentence 'It can be foreseen.....'
- (4) Under can spray heading on p.27, I would delete every sentence in the first paragraph. Leave only the last sentence 'Instead of an antibiotic.....'
- (5) In last paragraph--rewrite the end of the sentence 'will be an improvement on 'WaterJel' as 'will be useful'.
- (6) I wish to remove Claim 4 completely.

Please advise me if you need the specification rewritten. Please provide an e-mail address where I can send it as an attachment (Microsoft word document). I can do the rewrite in 2-3 days.

With regard to the two USA patent references (viz.: Burgeson et al.; Hoeffler et al. quoted by the examiner), I am using a human umbilical cord extracellular matrix (HUVECs ECM), which is acellular not the cells described in the USA granted patents. Admittedly, the umbilical cord (vein) is fetal tissue, but it is obtained after birth. In other words, there is no invasive procedure (i.e. going within the human body) to gain access to fetal tissue and nothing is dissected out. The two quoted patents do not envisage use of the underlying cell matrix (matrices).

The UK Patent office searches the same USA data bases, before issuing a UK patent on December 22nd 2004. Why did they (the UK Patent office) not quote those two USA patent references as 'prior art' to me? I remain puzzled.

Yours sincerely,

Denis E. Solomon

Denis E. Solomon

1/27/06

Page 1 of.....10/076,266.....Solomon DE

BEST AVAILABLE COPY